



GARY R. HERBERT
Governor

GREGORY S. BELL
Lieutenant Governor

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

MICHAEL R. STYLER
Executive Director

Division of Oil, Gas and Mining

JOHN R. BAZA
Division Director

December 27, 2010

Martin White
CMC Rock LLC
71 East Wadsworth Park Drive
Draper, Utah 84020

Subject: Second Review of Notice of Intention to Commence Large Mining Operations, CMC Rock LLC, Point West Mine, M/035/0042, Salt Lake County, Utah

Dear Mr. White:

The Division has completed a review of your Notice of Intention to Commence Large Mining Operations for the Point West Mine, located in Salt Lake County, Utah, which was received July 12, 2010. The attached comments will need to be addressed before tentative approval may be granted.

The comments are listed under the applicable Minerals Rule heading; please format your response in a similar fashion. Please address only those items requested in the attached technical review by sending replacement pages of the original mining notice using **redline and strikeout** text, so we can see what changes have been made. After the notice is determined technically complete and we are prepared to issue final approval, we will ask that you send us two clean copies of the complete and corrected plan. Upon final approval of the permit, we will return one copy stamped "approved" for your records.

The Division will suspend further review of the Notice of Intention until your response to this letter is received. If you have any questions in this regard please contact me (PBB) at 801-538-5261, Tom Munson (TM) at 801-538-5321, Wayne Western (WHW) at 801-538-5263, or Leslie Heppler (lah) at 801-538-5257. Thank you for your cooperation in completing this permitting action.

Sincerely,

Paul B. Baker
Minerals Program Manager

PBB:lah:eb

Attachment: Review

cc: Herriman City Planning Department

P:\GROUPS\MINERALS\WP\M035-SaltLake\M0350042 Point West\final\REV2-3631,3736-11182010.doc

3703



**SECOND REVIEW OF NOTICE OF INTENTION
TO COMMENCE LARGE MINING OPERATIONS**

**CMC Rock LLC
Point West Mine
M/035/0042
December 27, 2010**

General Comments:

Comment #	Sheet/Page/Map/Table #	Comments	Initials	Review Action
1	General	Submittal should be formatted to easily incorporate additional revisions and amendments.		
2	General	Table of Contents –Type the number of the map in the table of contents and note the location under the figure tab in the NOI. The maps are located under the figure tab, so the list of maps should be under the figure tab. (The figure tab is after the surety, and before the Appendix.)	lah	

R647-4-105 - Maps, Drawings & Photographs

General Map Comments

Comment #	Sheet/Page/Map/Table #	Comments	Initials	Review Action
3	Page 4 Map	Previous comment : <i>Map does not indicate site location. Site location should be indicated by the boundaries shown on cover sheet.</i> Please remove this map from the NOI. The little circle does not correctly show the location of the Point West permit. Rather than using this map, the Division suggests that the text refer to a map showing the permit boundary.	lah	

Specific Map Comments

105.1 Topographic base map, boundaries, pre-act disturbance

Comment #	Sheet/Page/Map/Table #	Comments	Initials	Review Action
4	Sheet 1	Previous comment : <i>Title block indicates "topographic base," but the base map is an airphoto. Correct the title block.</i> Correct the title block to read "Aerial Base map with Topographic contours".	lah	
5	Sheet 1	Previous comment : <i>Parcel lines are not correctly aligned on the base map. Correct the alignment.</i> If parcel lines are included on the map, the map should note where they are incorrect. It is clear that the parcel lines do not match many of the property boundaries or roads.	lah	
6	Sheet 1	Previous comment : <i>As shown – some of the haul roads to be improved are outside of the permit area. Haul roads need to be within the permit boundary. (Applies to all maps.)</i> Change all maps to reflect UDOT right of way for the Mountain View Corridor and include the proper changes to the CMC Haul roads.	lah	
7	Sheet 1	Green CMC disturbance area boundary should reflect a minimum of 5 years of mining that is to be bonded for. This is not required by rule but is recommended so frequent changes are not need to the permit.	lah	

Second Review
Page 3 of 4
M/035/0042
December 27, 2010

106.1 Plan for protecting & redepositing soils

Comment #	Sheet/Page/Map/Table #	Comments	Initials	Review Action
8	Pages 19 and 28	Both of these pages have reference to a vegetation survey that "will be" completed. The survey is in the plan, so the verb tense needs to be changed.	PBB	

R647-4-109 - Impact Assessment

109.1 Impacts to surface & groundwater systems

Comment #	Sheet/Page/Map/Table #	Comments	Initials	Review Action
9	Figure 1 and Figure 2	<p>The plan has a lot of good information about what is going to happen with erosion and surface water flows. The plan unfortunately lacks hydrological calculations for the on-stream sediment basins as shown on Figure 2, Best Management Practices. Figure 2 shows silt fences, check dams, and on stream sediment basins. On figure 2 there is a check dam cross section that is most likely mislabeled and should be labeled as an on stream sediment basin. Still there are no designs for these basins other than generic size per acre statements in the SWPPP. Please provide the size requirements for each basin. The plan also mentions culvert outlets for these basins in the SWPPP. Please show these spillways on the design drawings for these structures.</p> <p>Figure 1, Existing Condition, supplies peak flows for various points on the drainages but with no reference to the method used to calculate these peak flows. Please provide this information in the plan. Also, peak flows are used to size culverts and spillways but not ponds, so the purpose for these peak flows is not explained or correlated to the plan. The Division needs cross check the hydrologic calculations for the sizing of the on-stream sediment basins. The plan for the locations of these structures appears well thought out, but without cross checking the hydrologic calculations and designs, it is impossible to determine their adequacy.</p> <p>It appears that there are two classes of structures: check dams and on-stream sediment basins. Sediment basins need to be designed.</p>	TM	
10	Figure 3	This figure shows restored stream channels. No hydrologic sizing designs are shown on this figure or in the plan. Please describe how the channels will be restored and designed.	TM	
11	General	Please describe how sediment control will be constructed and phased in and out of the project during both the reclamation and construction phases. The check dams and on-stream sediment basins are good controls in conjunction with surface roughness of regraded surfaces to control sedimentation during reclamation. Ponds that will remain will need to be adequately sized and have demonstrated flow through capabilities. Please provide details in the reclamation plan that describes the final channel design.	TM	

Second Review
Page 4 of 4
M/035/0042
December 27, 2010

R647-4-110 - Reclamation Plan

110.5 Revegetation planting program

Comment #	Sheet/Page/Map/Table #	Comments	Initials	Review Action
12	Pages 18 and 28	These two pages show seed mixes to be used for topsoil protection, but they are not the same. Please reconcile this discrepancy. The Division recommends not using winter barley except for very short term revegetation, i.e. less than a year.	PBB	
13	Page 34	Please include a commitment to seed as soon as possible after surface preparation.	PBB	

R647-4-113 – Surety

Comment #	Sheet/Page/Map/Table #	Comments	Initials	Review Action
14	Appendix H	Please use the Division bonding spreadsheets which are available at http://linux1.ogm.utah.gov/WebStuff/wwwroot/minerals/bonding_worksheets.html .	WHW	
15	Appendix H	The unit costs used for demolition item #1 appear to be for building demolition. Many items like the jaw crusher, triple deck screens, cone crushers, radial stackers and conveyors are listed as portable equipment and would not be handled like buildings during reclamation. Please use RS Means costs for equipment removal. The fuel tanks and water tanks are not buildings, and the RS Means costs for tank removal should be used.	WHW	
16	Appendix H	Costs associated with demolition and removal of structures. Please use Blue Book equipment costs instead of CAT rental rate guides. The Division will supply those numbers upon request.	WHW	
17	Appendix H	Cost estimates from either Blue Book or RS Means should be used rather than quotes from vendors for trucking costs.	WHW	
18	Appendix H	Please include productivity data for earthwork. That information should include the amount of materials to be moved, the distance, grade, the type of equipment to be used, and productivity.	WHW	
19	Appendix H	The Division usually uses a cost of \$1,000 per acre for seeding/vegetation.		